

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion

PUBLIC LIBRARY

MAY 18 1949

DETROIT

VOL. IX, No. 8

MAY 16, 1949

\$2.00 per year; 10 cents per copy

America's Other Face

IN THE world at large there is a stereotype of America as the nation that still represents complete individualism. This stereotype fits the propaganda of Communists everywhere according to which our role is that of war-mongering reactionaries who are the enemies of justice for the people in all countries. Even our freedom is said to be only "formal freedom" which means in practice freedom that is limited to Wall Street as the symbol of the big capitalists who are supposed to run America.

One reason that this stereotype, merging as it does into the grosser Communist caricature, is so widely accepted is that few people in other lands realize what a revolution has taken place in this country since 1929. A large part of our press and of our business community has never been willing to admit that the changes of the Roosevelt period have come to stay and so they have not adjusted their own picture of America to them. The simple slogans about freedom still ring in our ears whenever those who advertise over the radio praise "the American way of life." It is still assumed by many of the agencies that form American public opinion that "free enterprise" is a sufficient formula for the solution of our problems. The political parties know otherwise. Neither major political party would dare confront the nation with a platform advocating the repeal of the social legislation of the last two decades. Any doubt about this should have been dispelled when Senator Taft recently gave his colleagues a lecture on the need for more social legislation.

The split between our national theories and slogans, which still seem to make the greatest impression abroad, and our actual practice has prevented us from sharing what real vision and experience we have as a nation with people on other continents. If we would allow our own picture of America to catch up with what we now actually do and will continue to do we could make an enormous contribution to the search for "a third way" in the organizing of society. It would be a third way—in contrast to the stereotype of America and in contrast to totalitarian collectivism. *We are experiment-*

ing with this third way ourselves. We have in practice abandoned the dogma of the sufficiency of free enterprise and we have accepted no collectivist dogma to take its place. Our federal system and the strength of our local communities make possible an enormous variety of centers of initiative, even on those matters concerning which a large measure of public responsibility has been accepted.

This American revolution since 1929 involves changes in assumptions, shifts in the location of power, and a great accumulation of social legislation.

The change in assumptions is evident in the recognition that it is the responsibility of the federal government to take whatever action may be necessary to prevent large scale unemployment. The old moralistic and individualistic attitudes toward unemployment are now discarded. Gone with them is the belief in control by suggestion and persuasion. It is not certain that our people or their government will be wise or skillful enough to act in time to prevent another great depression. But it is certain that the basic ideological inhibition about the responsibility of government to act will not be the obstacle that it was in 1929.

The most important change in the location of power is the very great change that has come over the status of organized labor. Less than two decades ago labor had to struggle against great odds for the right to organize. It had to struggle often against public opinion, against courts and police, against employers who were determined to break unions by means of terror if necessary. Today, labor has a favorable legal status and it has developed the power to defend its rights in most sectors of the economy.

It is not necessary to enumerate the forms of social legislation that we have come to take for granted. Even those measures which would now in all probability be accepted on a bipartisan basis constitute a fundamental reversal of the tendencies associated with American individualism. To cite the most recent example, only those who are in the public mind symbols of an extremely reactionary temper oppose the proposition that the federal government must

take an important share of responsibility for the provision of low cost housing.

Within the new social frame that is now here to stay there can be many differences of opinion as to where the line should be drawn between private and public initiative and between local and national forms of public activity. But this has ceased to be a matter that can be settled by individualistic dogmas.

This editorial is written in the light of much that is being said today in ecumenical circles about "the third way" which is defined in contrast to the usual conception of the Russian and American ways. Since we live in a world in which thought is largely controlled by propaganda that enormously oversimplifies the realities, it is important to point out that the realities of American life do not resemble the popular stereotype of America. There is great support here for a third way that transcends the conflict between individualism and collectivism.

In the resistance to the extension of Communism it would be of great help if America, which because of its power is so central in this resistance, did not so generally show to the world a reactionary face. Must people on other continents continue to believe that the two greatest powers represent the choice between a Communist system that promises justice for all and an individualist system that promises only freedom for the capitalists? It is difficult to counteract Communist propaganda but the split in the mind of America between one-sided individualist theory and our real political and economic institutions makes this task all the more difficult.

If we would make clear to the world the extent of the change that has taken place in American life, we would be able to give far more moral support to the peoples on other continents who, repelled by the usual stereotype of America, are seeking to preserve or to develop institutions which are favorable to spiritual and cultural freedom.—*John C. Bennett*

Our Duty Toward Displaced Persons

OUR foremost Christian job today is to resettle the Displaced Persons without further delay.

The smallest number to arrive in the United States thus far is Protestant. The reason for this distressing situation is simply that we Protestants are not caring for our own people as we should. If you are a Jewish Displaced Person you can expect to be resettled by the end of 1949. If you are a Catholic DP your chances of resettlement over your Protestant neighbor are about ten to one.

Thousands of Protestant and Orthodox DP families are still clinging desperately to the hope that

some person or church in America will send in a set of Assurance forms that will mean new life and opportunities for them.

The time has gone by when we Protestants can look upon our obligation to the DPs as a matter of convenience or benevolent interest. It now is an all-out emergency and it demands priority on every Christian conscience. Furthermore, it demands immediate expression of our Christian concern in action *now*. We Protestants are actively agitating for liberalized legislation for DPs, but we are not agitating our churches and communities to offer resettlement opportunities. That is the real test. We haven't time to wait for more favorable conditions.

The present law allows 205,000 Displaced Persons to enter the United States within a two-year period. Almost half of that allotted time already has slipped by, and we are lagging tragically while more precious moments go by. Should the present slow rate of Protestant resettlement continue, more than half of the Displaced Persons for whom we have special responsibility will be left behind, deserted and in despair. If this happens, we submit that not only will the Displaced Persons lose; we too will lose. We will have missed our day of opportunity, and America will be the poorer because these men and women have the kind of spirit, skills, leadership America needs.

The answer is clear. We must now set aside our timidity and reservations and bring our Christian beliefs into immediate action. If the words of our Lord, "I was a stranger and ye took me in," ever applied to a tragic human condition where we have the power to relieve it, it applies now. Some churches have accepted their responsibility, and are adding this emphasis to their regular relief programs. But this "adding to" is not enough. While other faiths are putting large united budgets and field staffs to work on this problem, and are achieving results, the Protestant Churches are still largely working on a denominational basis through regular staffs already over-burdened. In the few cases where the denominations have put special workers into the fields where the resettlement opportunities are, results are gratifying.

Every church can find a room and a job for at least one family. Colleges and other groups can sponsor students. Individuals can find, or make a place for a DP. The Protestant DP emergency calls for united national statesmanship and action—*now*.

Send immediately for Assurance forms to your denominational headquarters, your city or state Council of Churches, or directly to Church World Service, Inc., 214 East 21st Street, New York 10, N. Y.—*Roland Elliott*

The Outlook for Christianity in China

SEARLE BATES

GRIM years face Christian effort in China. A third of the country is under Communist organization, other parts are under Communist influence, and the remainder is threatened with prompt subjection. Those who dream of an anti-Communist revival, with or without American aid, are far from the ground. There is no evidence of effective resistance, present or potential, to Communist consolidation of the Chinese nation. Dislike and fear, yes; trusted leadership and organization against Communism, or the ghost of a real idea, no.

The Kuomintang, which monopolized all public life in milksop imitation of Russian totalitarianism—mimicked even in the details of its party design—confidently monopolized, as of course, the struggle against Communism. Now, when the Kuomintang has died of chronic bureaucracy complicated by acute ineptitude, its consistent suppression of all opinion and activity not its own has left the perfect memorial—an apathetic zero. In a brief statement like the present one, which can select only a few aspects of a large subject by no means simple, what is past must be quickly dropped.

Indeed, multitudes of Chinese have been driven by the weariness of near twelve years of warfare, by the exhaustion of nine years' inflation in which three currencies have plunged to perdition, by the agonizing futility and corruption of Chiang Kai-shek's regime, to turn to "anything but this." The one actual alternative is Communism, promising bread, land, and peace, even as in the Russia of 1917. Those are the well-nigh universal needs, so pressing that the needs themselves almost utter the red promises before the Communists declare them. Does not every anxious laborer, every yokel, every schoolboy know that the Communists provide plain food for those who work, and most conspicuously for those who join their army and political groups; land for small tenants and the village dispossessed, blithely wiping out the burdensome landlord; free education, free food, a guaranteed job for every student and budding artisan or technician, thus completing the acquisition of millions of the active, the discontented, the hopeful elements of a needy society?

And if the older, shrewder, less eager or less desperate folks doubt the economic or administrative credentials of the reddish glow, they unite in the cry for relief from war and all its accumulated misery. Since Communism inexorably advances, resistance to Communism means continuing war, hopeless war. Submission to Communism means peace.

Peace is the dominant desire, the pearl of great price. Communism is identified with peace, for which the exchange of a never-achieved liberty cannot be questioned. Such is the ground-swell of attitudes in the regions about to pass to Communist rule.

The mood of the areas already under the Communists is less clearly apparent. It includes, in weights sharply varying by person by place and by time, at least the following factors: (a) appreciative respect for the discipline of Communist regular troops—though not for bandits on whom pink halos have been conferred; (b) approval of severe measures against the larger landlords and usurers; (c) favorable response to some efforts to improve agricultural production and the life of ordinary villagers; (d) resentment against much wider conscription than China has ever known; (e) dislike of training programs or forced labor which break up families for weeks and months or indefinitely, removing not only boys but women and girls to barrack life; (f) disappointment in finding that Communist taxes and levies though usually consolidated and regular, are in fact heavy; (g) realization that efficiency in all mechanics of guerilla struggles, the culmination of long specialization in that art, does not readily carry over into the total task of government, and has not touched vast problems such as industrial management and development, or education; (h) objection to being pushed around by the crude fanatics and the power-drunk adolescents who play too large a part in the lower ranks of Communist personnel; (i) dread of the dark when publication, radio, and discussion are held forcibly to the authoritarian channel; (j) some acceptance of the Communist plea that China is being delivered from slavery to American capitalist-imperialism and its puppet Chiang, some anxiety regarding the pro-Russian line, with thought of Manchuria, Mongolia, and Sinkiang as payments on account; and finally, (k) that bulwark of every revolt that is succeeding, the proud satisfaction of those who joined in time, the sense of new achievement, new power, new opportunity among the fresh aristocracy.

Will the Chinese Communists follow in the system of the Moscow sun and the European satellites, or will they work out something less severe, something less alien to the customary self-management of Chinese peasants? Their record and their pronouncements to date do not make a precise answer, but they are closer to the Russian type than their previous publicity in the West would suggest. After

their failure twenty-odd years ago to find a base in Chinese cities, they were forced to build up power as rural fighters, with tactics and promises adapted to that job and to the opportunities of the Japanese invasion. Their ultimate goals, however, have been deliberately and clearly stated as complete Communism; and their procedure has been elaborately set forth as "democratic centralism" in the Russian sense—the monolithic system directed from a single control tower, but striving for the maximum of mass support.

How much temporizing, how much diluting, may be needful in the vast sea of China's undisciplined population, no one can predict. Of blundering experiment with inadequate personnel, we may expect plenty. It is difficult to see for Communism assured success or assured failure in the Chinese prospect alone. Possibly the international trends of the next decade or two may swing the balance here.

By most Chinese Christians, Communist rule is accepted as fate. Its declared aims of lifting up the toiling masses and its stern stand against exploitation by landlords and capitalists, are readily agreed to. In constructive social work some common ground appears. Difficulties and anxieties lie chiefly in three fields, of conscious concern more to responsible leadership than to the bulk of humble members.

(1) A totalitarian program has no real place for private associations, though it may for an expedient interval allow them to exist within strict limits and under close supervision. Protestant Christianity is relatively strong in educational and medical institutions, and has depended considerably upon them in personnel and in program. But Communists consider education a prime function of the "revolutionary" state, in which independent purposes and independent management are simply unthinkable. School curricula must be based upon Marxism and be thoroughly permeated with it. Thus far, Chinese Communists have barely recognized "general education," because they have centered their effort upon short-time training for military and political purposes. Moreover, they consider education and health to be free services as of right, which only the state has resources to maintain and which are integral parts of its relations with the people. Rights of assembly, of speech, and of publication, are recognized only for the purposes of serving the regime according to its required procedure as interpreted by police and party agents; not for upholding any other standard of life. Such is the pattern. But practice has not been standardized, and it is possible that the colossal needs for education and health work may secure some breathing space for the Christian schools and hospitals.

(2) Chinese Communism is committed to the grant of religious liberty in the Russian sense—translated as "freedom of belief," and simultaneously elaborated as including freedom to reject and to oppose religion. The welter of inconsistent practice seems to indicate: (a) frequent tolerance of church services as socially insignificant for good or for harm; (b) a good deal of irregular pressure on full-time Christian workers as unproductive and not entitled to share in public food supply. The past year of rapid Communist expansion has been marked by a lessening of the violence that brought considerable death and much suffering to Christian workers in 1946 and 1947. The change appears to be part of the new tactic to arouse less opposition of all sorts and to cause less disturbance of normal life in freshly entered districts. It is too early to make inferences for the future. But pastors in many areas now are continuing their work with one adjustment or another. Communists have admitted Christians as party members, despite previous statements of the contrary stand. Their leaders definitely condemn all religion as superstition, the foe of science which is the beneficent tool of Communism in promoting human welfare. In some situations the propaganda attacks upon Christianity have been severe, though seldom persistent in any one place.

(3) Chinese Communism, in following the Russian line and in attacking Chiang Kai-shek who seemed to have the call upon American aid, is continually assaulting everything American or American-related. One must not rush to the view that the American taint is the only taint; for Britishers have about the same experience that we do, and Danish and Swedish Protestants, Belgian and Swiss Catholics, have probably suffered more than the far more numerous Americans. There are spots of much hostility or suspicion against all foreigners or foreign interests, much on the lines of Russia's Nationalist-Communist exclusiveness. But again, particularly in recent months, there has been a mingling of restraint and conciliation with harsh propaganda and occasional severity in act. At this moment the temper seems to be worsening once more, but no long-term tendency has been established. It is doubtful whether foreign contributions to Christian enterprises can be accepted, whether missionaries will have sufficient freedom to justify their remaining indefinitely in China, whether Chinese Christians will find Western missionaries an aid or a burden if the Russian type of pressure persists. American aid, military or semi-military, to Chiang Kai-shek's putrescent factions, would tend to increase the risks for Christian interests. There is no assurance that China's need for machinery, oil, and cotton will prevail over the desire to shut off all "capitalist-imperialist" influences and contacts; and Russia has

shown that it is possible to carry on a measure of economic exchange with the processes of wartime trade and a stiff quarantine against foreign vermin.

Such are the dangers to be contemplated. The Communist program in China is by no means hardened, however, and Chinese moderation, as well as Chinese nationalism, may exert more influence, in the short run or in the long, than now appears probable. Christians have tried to put their own house in order, no small task in the aftermath of lengthened warfare and in a ruined society. Almost all of them will avoid needless offence, many of them to the degree of prompt conformity to all public requirements. Some are active and alert to increase their actual service and to find new opportunities for Christian witness, whether or not the old doors may be closed. Almost all refuse to anticipate disaster, and have faith, whether or not it is temporally justified, that things will not go the worst extremes. How much of this attitude is based on ignorance of peril, how much on the usual easy-going Chinese confidence that some way can be found somehow to get along on some level, how much on real trust in the Spirit, is for heavenly assessment. *Mutatis mutandis*, the preceding statement may also apply in general fashion to missionaries, who do not know whether they will be casually permitted or harshly denied the work of their lives, whether they will be grudgingly tolerated as the savor inseparable from petroleum products, or whether they can maintain their service by endurance and suffering rather than by bank transfers.

Meanwhile, political change and social revolution are not visibly reducing the immensity of human needs. Sickness and death abound in every village, every alley; unlettered ignorance and barely lettered shadow-knowledge hamper child and adult together; despair contends with dubious faith for mastery of youth. Daily Christian work goes forward in a thousand centers with more than commonplace response. We wait, not idly. We must believe that from the crumbling of outworn systems and from the stirring of the masses there will in the providence of God come good. That Communism in China will survive by sloughing off its grosser faults and by turning toward a truer community than we now see in its crude trial and coarse error; or that it will in turn break down in its failure to realize a requisite measure of that community which we Christians call the City of God.

Will we continue to see the letters and papers and books that mean so much in the world fellowship? We hope so. But we must prepare to do without them for a time. Can we communicate with you? We hope so. But perhaps not again with the frankness of old, for to truth as you and we understand truth, would be ascribed reactionary intent.

Religious Tensions

ROBERT A. ASHWORTH

WE MUST accept the existence of religious tensions as a fact. Many express the opinion that in this country they are increasing and strengthening. They have always existed, and everywhere. Religion which, from the etymology of the word, might be expected to serve as a bond drawing men together, has, all through history, been an occasion of contention, has driven men apart and has sometimes set them in hostile camps.

Religious tensions are inevitable. Religion deals with the basic and ultimate values of mankind. Religion teaches that upon the acceptance or rejection of the truths which it affirms human destiny depends. When you have two religious groups, Protestants and Roman Catholics we will say, each of which affirms that what it teaches is true and that much at least of what the other teaches is false, each of which makes some claims to the exclusive possession of truth, there are bound to be competitions and clashes, or, in other words, religious tensions. Neither will feel that it is right or possible to be tolerant toward error. And it is difficult to distinguish between wrong beliefs on matters of such moment as those with which religion deals, and those who hold them. "I do not believe a word you say, but I will fight to the death for your right to say it," a statement which, by the way, I am credibly informed was not made by Voltaire, requires an attitude which it is far from easy for any convinced Protestant or Catholic to take.

Yet more thoughtful people than ever before are today convinced that existing religious tensions must be resolved. They say that in the kind of a world in which we are living such tensions are a threat to human welfare. They say that in this narrowly constricted world in which we must live so close together, it is imperative that we learn to live as neighbors. They say that this is, to borrow a phrase, a time for greatness, and that we must be big enough for the sake of a peaceful life and for the sake of national unity, to find some kind of common ground upon which we can live and work together though our religious beliefs and practices are different.

There have been those who used to say that religion must lead the way and compose its differences or world peace would be impossible. They said that if religionists could not do this it was futile to suppose that nations could do it.

As a matter of fact, however, the nations have made much greater progress during the last year or two in the direction of political peace than the churches have made in that of religious peace. Per-

haps religious leaders might borrow a leaf from the United Nations book.

The problems that have faced the nations in the political field have been very much the same as those that face the churches in the religious field. There have been conflicting ideologies, different theories of government, insistence on national sovereignty, mutual suspicion and distrust, the veto power, each of which has its counterpart in the churches.

Yet in the United Nations the governments of the world have dared to set up a banner to which all nations that desire peace may repair. In Article I of the Charter the nations have stated their purposes to be to maintain international peace and security; to develop friendly relations among nations and self-determination of peoples; to achieve international cooperation for the attainment of certain ends which all the nations desire in common; and to be a center for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends.

In the preamble to the Charter the nations assert their determination to do certain desirable things together and "for these ends"—to choose the determination most pertinent to the relations of the churches to one another—"to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors."

This is a rule of conduct that philosophy and religion have long taught to be essential to peace. That it has now been formally adopted as a determination on the part of nations is a milestone in human progress.

It would seem as though the churches thus led by the nations, might adopt and publicly affirm for themselves the determination "to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors." Such a determination, if carried out, would resolve the religious tensions and antagonisms that hold the worshippers of God apart.

This determination, thus proclaimed by the United Nations, has not yet been realized in the life of the nations. But informed observers are assuring us that progress toward it is being made.

It was early discovered in the conferences of national representatives that a prime requisite is mutual respect and trust. In the degree in which these are lacking, common action is impossible. The nations must have faith in one another. They must assume each other's sincerity. Where that is impossible there can be no United Nations.

Such mutual respect and trust is a *sine qua non* of interconfessional fellowship and cooperation. Leaders of the United Nations are quick to deplore and resent statements of irresponsible journalists or commentators who spread rumors or interpret events in a fashion to cast doubt upon or publicly discredit the motives of any nation. Delicate relationships and negotiations may be disrupted by such measures.

Similarly, when mutual respect and trust are impossible between religious bodies nothing good is possible between them, and invidious statements about a religious group by individuals of another group, even though those individuals may be of little weight of themselves, have effects upon inter-group relations far more deleterious than their intrinsic importance warrants.

It is essential, if wholesome human relations among the religious groups that compose our American citizenship are to be maintained, that the avenues of communication between them should be kept open and that the possibility of conference should not be destroyed. If that is to be the case the debate must be conducted upon the highest possible plane. It must be based upon the assumption that the motives of the differing groups are equally sincere. Any imputation of insincerity to those who differ in their contentions, or of sinister or ulterior purpose, automatically closes the door to conference, compromise or agreement and exacerbates controversy. Where such assumption is impossible it must be evident that there can be no end to controversy.

The serious differences of conviction that divide Protestants and Roman Catholics need not be minimized or ignored. But neither should the common objectives of these two religious groups who worship the same God and share very many moral and religious purposes. The threat of secularism and materialism in our day is directed against all religion, whether of Protestants, Catholics or Jews, and all who believe in God should combine their efforts to combat it.

Both in international and in interreligious relationships the best corrective to prejudice is understanding. It is difficult for those of one nation to understand the history, tradition and habits of thought and conduct of the people of another nation. It is not more easy for those of one religious group to understand those of another. It is easy to misinterpret and misunderstand. The most fruitful source of prejudice is ignorance. We are likely to fear that which we do not fully comprehend. Suspicion is often the product of misunderstanding. When we are rightly informed as to the beliefs and practices of our neighbors, we may still disagree with them profoundly but we are not as likely to dislike, distrust or malign them.

The degree of ignorance of Protestants about Catholics, or of Catholics about Protestants is very often abysmal. It is greater than even that of Americans about Russians or of Russians about Americans. For the sake of religious peace every opportunity should be seized to interpret Protestantism to Catholics and Catholicism to Protestants. The best interpreter of Catholicism is an informed Catholic, and the best interpreter of Protestantism is an informed Protestant. Catholics should not attempt

to interpret Protestantism nor Protestants Catholicism.

The United Nations "is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states." Without such a recognition of national sovereignty there could have been no United Nations. Some day the insistence of the constituent nations upon their respective sovereignties may be modified, and each may be willing to surrender a proportion of it. But not now. The analogy with the churches is clear. If harmony and cooperation are to be established in the field of religion, it must be among religious institutions that do not relinquish any of their claims. That will be difficult but not impossible.

That would suggest that the cooperation to be sought must be upon the civic, not the religious plane. We should not seek, not now, common worship. The limitations it imposes upon believers are too severe to be wholesome. Members of every religious group should be free at all times to express their full faith. The areas of cooperation among Protestants, Catholics and Jews are those of common interest, concern, and responsibility to them as American citizens. It has sometimes been said that these three religious groups may be in their religious interests as separate as the fingers of an outstretched hand, while in civic matters as united as the fingers of a closed fist.

Nor need their cooperation in civic matters restrict them in their witness to religious truth as they respectively see it. It is of the essence of their faith, indeed, that both Protestants and Catholics should

proclaim and propagate it and that each should seek to win others to the truth as they see it. This will do no injury to human relations if each holds the other in respect and if neither rewards nor threats are used to buttress the appeals of spiritual persuasion.

Neither is any policy of appeasement necessary to achieve religious peace. The policy of "firmness" which the United States has announced that it is pursuing and which Russia appears to have pursued from the first without any announcement, is fidelity to principles, is it not, without compromise? No other procedure promises anything, whether in international or interreligious affairs. Whether Protestant or Catholic we must proclaim the truth as we see it even though it may be critical of what other groups are doing or saying, but we must speak the truth in love.

So much for the principles that should control the relations of religious groups. The method that should be used of course, is that of conference. That is the method used by the United Nations to compose the differences that divide the people of the world. As a method it has its difficulties, but there is no substitute. Any nation, or any religion, that lives in isolation, and refuses to confer, in this sort of world, is naturally suspect and a source of danger. The only remedy for the weaknesses of conference is more conference. Our political leaders in the international field are learning that. With the patience and persistence that these are exhibiting our religious leaders could achieve comparable results.

The World Church: News and Notes

Protestant Missionaries Remain in Nanking

About fifty Protestant missionaries have remained in Nanking, Communist-seized former Nationalist capital, according to word brought to Shanghai by the Rev. Stanton Lautenschlager, Presbyterian missionary from Worcester, Mass., who has been on a tour of Chinese mission centers.

Mr. Lautenschlager, who left Nanking just before the Communist take-over, said the missionaries were awaiting the arrival of the invading forces "unperturbedly." He added that the missionaries had decided months ago to stay at their posts, and "recent events have not altered their plans."—*Religious News Service*.

Bevin Says Protestant Chapels Closed in Spain

Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin told the House of Commons that seven English Protestant chapels in Spain have been closed since 1947 by order of the Spanish authorities.

Bevin's remark came in answer to a question from a Conservative member of the House. The Foreign Secretary said that several protests by the British government had been unavailing. He added that he believed the closings were caused by "religious intolerance."

—*Religious News Service*.

East-West Parley Held On International Affairs

Three churchmen from Czechoslovakia and one from Hungary joined with 29 churchmen from the Western nations and the Orient in a conference on international problems held at the Ecumenical Institute, Bossey, Switzerland.

The conference drew up recommendations on international affairs to be submitted to the International Missionary Council and the World Council of Churches whose Central Committee will meet at Chichester, England, this summer.

Although the recommendations have not been released for publication at this time, the members of the conference issued a statement that "every possible effort

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion
537 West 121st St., New York 27, N. Y.

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR, *Chairman*

JOHN C. BENNETT	LISTON POPE
HENRY SLOANE COFFIN	HENRY P. VAN DUSEN
F. ERNEST JOHNSON	GLOSTER MORRIS, <i>Sec'y</i>

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JAMES C. BAKER	HENRY SMITH LELPER
CHARLES W. GILKEY	JOHN A. MACKAY
LYNN HAROLD HOUGH	RHODA E. MCCULLOCH
UMPHREY LEE	FRANCIS P. MILLER
	EDWARD L. PARSONS
HOWARD CHANDLER ROBBINS	

must be made to maintain the ecumenical fellowship between the churches in the areas under different political systems," and reaffirmed the Amsterdam Assembly's position that "the church cannot identify itself with any political system."—*E. P. S., Geneva.*

U. S. Missionaries Appeal to U. N. For Action on South African Race Politics

The following resolution, adopted by the Africa Committee of the Foreign Missions Conference, meeting in New York City on April 8, has been submitted to the United Nations:

TEXT . . . Within recent weeks alarming news has come from the Union of South Africa—news which affects the whole world Christian community. The news reports indicate that the recent election of Dr. D. F. Malan to the premiership on the platform of *apartheid* implies the curtailment of the meager rights and privileges of the large non-European population of South Africa, such curtailment applying to the African, Indian and colored sections of the community in varying degrees but on a common principle of racial and color discrimination.

Periodical Division
Detroit Public Library
5201 Woodward Ave.
Detroit 2, Mich.

650 1-50 Authors in This Issue:

Roland Elliott is the Director of the Department for Displaced Persons, Church World Service, Inc., New York City, New York.

Searle Bates is Professor of History at the University of Nanking, Nanking, China.

Robert A. Ashworth is Editorial Secretary for the National Conference of Christians and Jews, New York City, New York.

There appears to be great pressure upon the present Nationalist-dominated Parliament of the Union of South Africa to commit itself to the imposition and maintenance of complete and unshared white rule; the elimination of all non-European representation in Parliament even by white representatives; the denial of the franchise to all non-white citizens, and the extension of strict segregation even into spheres where it does not already exist.

It seems to the Africa Committee to be the clear duty of Christian people everywhere to express in the strongest terms the conviction that such policies, anywhere and under all circumstances, are definitely unchristian. We are also strongly of the opinion that the situation developing in South Africa, contributing as it does to the growing feeling of frustration in the Africans and intensifying race tension, is a matter of international concern.

THEREFORE, Be It Resolved:

(1) That the Africa Committee views with alarm and disapproval the current racial policies which the present administration is pressing upon the Parliament of the Union of South Africa;

(2) That this Committee denounces the efforts of those of whatever race who would create or stimulate friction between the Indian and Native sections of the South African population;

(3) That the Committee considers that the policies under consideration are in violation of the spirit of the International Covenant and Declaration on Human Rights of the United Nations, and asks the United Nations to deal appropriately with the matter.

—*E. P. S., New York.*

Report Dutch Army Executes Javanese Christians

In the course of a "cleaning up action" by the Dutch army on Sunday morning, February 20, ten members of the Christian congregation of Peniwen, including a member of the church council, were killed. The execution took place at 9 o'clock in the morning, the customary hour for the Sunday morning worship service.

The report of the mass execution was carried by the monthly paper of the Church of East Java—to which the Peniwen congregation belongs—and by papers in Holland.

The matter has been taken up by the Ecumenical Council of the Churches in the Netherlands and the Board of Missions at Oegstgeest. The Government of the Netherlands has undertaken an immediate investigation into the affairs at Peniwen, with the assurance that, if the facts are confirmed, the guilty will be punished.—*E. P. S., Geneva.*